



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 10/696,996 | 10/31/2003 | Hong Rae Cha | HI-0184 | 8240 |
| 34610 | 7590 | 06/09/2006 | | EXAMINER |
| FLESHNER & KIM, LLP | | | | SANEI, HANA ASMAT |
| P.O. BOX 221200 | | | | |
| CHANTILLY, VA 20153 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2879 | |

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/696,996 | CHA, HONG RAE |
| | Examiner Hana A. Sanei | Art Unit 2879 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 5-49 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 5-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Amendment, filed on 3/21/06, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Claims 5-49 are pending in the instant application

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 10-12, 25, 27, 34-35, 37, 39, 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tone et al (US 6686536 B2).

With respect to Claim 10, Tone a panel having at least an upper substrate and a lower substrate (see at least Figure 8, #1); a film type front surface filter (AR layer, see at least Figure 5, #8) formed on a front surface of the panel (see Fig. 7); a back cover (Figure 8, bottom portion of the “Box” enclosing) spaced from and disposed in a backward portion of the panel to cover the backward portion of the panel; a front cover (Figure 8, combination of electroconductive gasket, 17 and metal fixing jig) disposed between the film type front surface filter and the back cover and between the film type

front surface filter and the front cover to physically support the film type front surface filter and electrically connect (via gasket, 17) with the front cover; and a first conductive layer (electroconductive member, 6) formed between the end portion of the film type front surface filter and the filter support to electrically connect the film type front surface filter and the filter support.

With respect to Claim 11, Tone teaches that the first conductive layer (electroconductive member, 6) comprising a metallic mesh layer (Col. 13, lines 15-16).

With respect to Claim 12, Tone teaches that the first conductive layer comprises an EMI shielding layer (Col. 13, lines 47-55).

With respect to Claim 25, Tone teaches that the film type front surface filter is of an AR layer (see at least Figure 5, #8).

With respect to Claim 27, Tone teaches that the film type front surface filter does not include glass (color-correcting function, Col. 7, lines 55-67 – Col. 8, lines 1-2)

With respect to Claim 34, Tone teaches a PDP comprising a panel (see at least Figure 7, #1); a front surface filter (see at least Figure 5, #8); a first metallic layer (electroconductive member, 6), a back cover (bottom portion of the “Box” enclosing envelope); a front cover (Figure 7, top opening portion of the “Box”); a filter support (Figure 7, top opening portion of the “Box” that which is connected to the bottom portion of the “Box”).

With respect to Claim 35, Tone teaches that the first metallic layer is further formed on a lateral face of the front surface filter (further metallic layer found on the

inner surfaces of the "Box" being "treated" to be electroconductive, Col. 5, lines 15-20 & Col. 10, lines 32-35).

With respect to Claim 37, Tone teaches that the front surface filter is a film type front surface filter ("front plate," 1 of Fig. 7).

With respect to Claim 39, Tone teaches a PDP comprising a panel (see at least Figure 7, #1); a front surface filter (see at least Figure 5, #8); a metallic layer (inner surfaces of "Box" being "treated" to be electroconductive, Col. 5, lines 15-20 & Col. 10, lines 32-35), a back cover (bottom portion of the "Box" enclosing envelope); a filter support (Figure 7, top opening portion of the "Box" that which is connected to the bottom portion of the "Box").

With respect to Claim 49, Tone teaches that the film type front surface filter does not include a glass layer (color-correcting function, Col. 7, lines 55-67 – Col. 8, lines 1-2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 13, 26, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tone et al (US 6686536 B2) in view of Yoshikawa et al (US 6255778 B1).

With respect to Claim 13, Tone teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 10 above). Tone lacks a second conductive layer. In the same field

of endeavor, Yoshikawa teaches a second conductive layer that is further disposed between the first conductive layer and the filter support (lower layer of conductive member mesh, 3 constitutes the second conductive layer see at least Figure 3) in order to ensure good conduction between the conductive member mesh and the body of equipment (Col. 11, lines 50-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the second conductive layer, as disclosed by Yoshikawa, in the PDP of Tone in order to ensure good conduction between the conductive member mesh and the body of equipment.

With respect to Claim 26, Tone-Yoshikawa teaches a second conductive layer comprising a shielding foam gasket (refer to '536; #17, Figure 8). Motivation to combine would be the same as recited in Claim 13.

With respect to Claim 36, Tone teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 34 above). Tone lacks a second metallic layer. In the same field of endeavor, Yoshikawa teaches a second metallic layer that is further disposed between the first metallic layer and the filter support (lower layer of conductive member mesh, 3 constitutes the second metallic layer see at least Figure 3) formed on a lateral face of the front surface filter in order to ensure good conduction between the conductive member mesh and the body of equipment (Col. 11, lines 50-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the second metallic layer, as disclosed by Yoshikawa, in the PDP of Tone in order to ensure good conduction between the conductive member mesh and the body of equipment.

3. Claim 5-7, 9, 14-16, 18, 22-24, 28-31, 33, 38, 40-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tone et al (US 6686536 B2) in view of Koike et al (US 6965191 B2).

With respect to Claim 5, Tone teaches a PDP comprising a panel (see at least Figure 7, #1); a film type front surface filter (see at least Figure 5, #8); a back cover (bottom portion of the “Box” enclosing envelope); a filter support (Figure 7, top opening portion of the “Box” that which is connected to the bottom portion of the “Box”); a support member (metal-fixing jig, Figure 7) connected to the back cover; and a metallic layer (inner surfaces of “Box” being “treated” to be electroconductive, Col. 5, lines 15-20 & Col. 10, lines 32-35). It should be noted that Tone’s support member is connected to the back cover via the filter support.

Tone lacks a film type front surface filter that has a wider area than the panel. In the same field of endeavor, Koike teaches a film type front surface filter (functional transparent layer, Col. 7, lines 7-9; Col. 9, lines 7-16; Figure 6, #60) that has a wider area than the panel in order to ensure capability of shielding other electromagnetic waves than a visible light from among electromagnetic waves generated from display screen (Col. 1, lines 9-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the area of the film type front surface filter, as disclosed by Koike, in the PDP of Tone in order to ensure capability of shielding other electromagnetic waves than a visible light from among electromagnetic waves generated from display screen.

Tone further lacks a metallic layer formed on an extending portion of the film type front surface filter. In the same field of endeavor, Koike teaches a metallic layer (Figure 6, #80; Col. 5, lines 10-17) formed on an extending portion of the film type front surface filter in order to overall play a role in aiding in the shielding an extremely intense electromagnetic wave emitted from a plasma display (Col. 4, lines 27-31). It should be noted that Koike's teaching of the extension of the film type front surface filter supplies sufficient evidence that the metallic layer of Toke (inner surfaces of "Box" being "treated" to be electroconductive, Col. 5, lines 15-20 & Col. 10, lines 32-35 of '536) will inherently be formed on or disposed above the extension. However, for further clarity, Examiner introduces the metallic layer of Koike (Figure 6, #80; Col. 5, lines 10-17 of '191) to clearly support that the result of an initial extension inherently results in the metallic layer being formed on the extending portion of the film type front surface filter. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add modify the metallic layer, as disclosed by Koike, in the PDP of Tone in order to overall play a role in aiding in the shielding an extremely intense electromagnetic wave emitted from a plasma display.

With respect to Claim 6, Tone teaches that the metallic layer is formed between the filter support and the support member (see at least Figure 7).

With respect to Claim 7, Tone teaches that the metallic layer is electrically connected with the film type front surface filter and the filter support (see at least Figure 7).

With respect to Claim 9, Tone teaches that the metallic layer, the filter support and the support member respectively have at least one hole and a screw (metallic screw, Figure 7) disposed to pass through the hole such that the metallic layer, the filter support and the support member are fixed to one another (refer at least Figure 7).

With respect to Claim 14, Tone teaches a PDP comprising panel having an upper substrate and a lower substrate (see at least Figure 8, #1); an film type front surface filter (see at least Figure 5, #8) disposed at a front surface of the panel; a back cover (Figure 8, bottom portion of the "Box" enclosing) spaced from and disposed in a backward portion of the panel to cover the backward portion of the panel; a filter support (Figure 8, combination of electroconductive gasket, 17 and metal fixing jig) disposed between the film type front surface filter and the back cover to physically support the film type front surface filter and electrically connect (via front cover and metallic screw) with the back cover; and a first conductive layer (electroconductive member, 6) formed between the end portion of the film type front surface filter and the filter support to electrically connect the film type front surface filter and the filter support.

Tone lacks a film type front surface filter that has a wider area than the panel. In the same field of endeavor, Koike teaches a film type front surface filter (functional transparent layer, Col. 7, lines 7-9; Col. 9, lines 7-16; Figure 6, #60) that has a wider area than the panel, and connected with the front cover, so that the film type front surface filter has an extended portion in at least a part thereof beyond the edges of the panel in order to ensure capability of shielding other electromagnetic waves than a visible light from among electromagnetic waves generated from display screen (Col. 1,

lines 9-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the area of the film type front surface filter, as disclosed by Koike, in the PDP of Tone in order to ensure capability of shielding other electromagnetic waves than a visible light from among electromagnetic waves generated from display screen.

Tone further lacks a first conductive layer formed between the extended portion of the film type front surface filter and the filter support to electrically connect the film type front surface filter and the filter support. In the same field of endeavor, Koike teaches a first conductive layer (Figure 6, #10; Col. 5, lines 10-17) formed between the extended portion of the film type front surface filter and the filter support to electrically connect the film type front surface filter and the filter support in order to shield an extremely intense electromagnetic wave emitted from a plasma display (Col. 4, lines 27-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add modify the first conductive layer, as disclosed by Koike, in the PDP of Tone in order to shield an extremely intense electromagnetic wave emitted from a plasma display.

With respect to Claim 15, Tone teaches a front cover (Figure 7, top opening portion of the "Box").

With respect to Claim 16, Tone-Koike teaches that the extended portion of the film type front surface filter is connected with the front cover (Figure 7, top opening portion of the "Box" that which is connected to the bottom portion of the "Box" denoted as the *back cover*).

With respect to Claim 18, Tone-Koike teaches a second conductive layer comprising a shielding foam gasket (refer to '536; #17, Figure 8). Motivation to combine would be the same as recited in Claim 16.

With respect to Claim 22-23, Tone teaches that the first conductive layer comprises an EMI shielding layer (Col. 13, lines 47-55) comprising a metallic mesh layer (Col. 13, lines 15-16).

With respect to Claim 24, Tone teaches that the film type front surface filter comprises an AR layer (see at least Figure 5, #8).

With respect to Claim 28, Tone teaches that the film type front surface filter does not include glass (color-correcting function, Col. 7, lines 55-67 – Col. 8, lines 1-2).

With respect to Claim 29, Tone teaches a PDP comprising a panel (see at least Figure 7, #1); a film type front surface filter (see at least Figure 5, #8); a back cover (bottom portion of the "Box" enclosing envelope); a filter support (Figure 7, top opening portion of the "Box" that which is connected to the bottom portion of the "Box"); a support member (metal-fixing jig, Figure 7) connected to the back cover; and a metallic layer (inner surfaces of "Box" being "treated" to be electroconductive, Col. 5, lines 15-20 & Col. 10, lines 32-35). It should be noted that Tone's support member is connected to the back cover via the filter support.

Tone lacks a film type front surface filter that has a wider area than the panel. In the same field of endeavor, Koike teaches a film type front surface filter (functional transparent layer, Col. 7, lines 7-9; Col. 9, lines 7-16; Figure 6, #60) that has a wider area than the panel in order to ensure capability of shielding other electromagnetic

waves than a visible light from among electromagnetic waves generated from display screen (Col. 1, lines 9-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the area of the film type front surface filter, as disclosed by Koike, in the PDP of Tone in order to ensure capability of shielding other electromagnetic waves than a visible light from among electromagnetic waves generated from display screen.

Tone further lacks a metallic layer formed on the film type front surface filter, which does not overlap the panel. In the same field of endeavor, Koike teaches a metallic layer (Figure 6, #80; Col. 5, lines 10-17) formed on the film type front surface filter, which does not overlap the panel in order to overall play a role in aiding in the shielding an extremely intense electromagnetic wave emitted from a plasma display (Col. 4, lines 27-31). It should be noted that Koike's teaching of the extension of the film type front surface filter supplies sufficient evidence that the metallic layer of Toke (inner surfaces of "Box" being "treated" to be electroconductive, Col. 5, lines 15-20 & Col. 10, lines 32-35 of '536) will inherently be formed on the film type front surface filter, on an portion which does not overlap the panel. However, for further clarity, Examiner introduces the metallic layer of Koike (Figure 6, #80; Col. 5, lines 10-17 of '191) to clearly support that the result of an initial extension inherently results in the metallic layer being formed on the film type front surface filter that does not overlap the panel. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add modify the metallic layer, as disclosed by Koike, in the PDP of

Tone in order to overall play a role in aiding in the shielding an extremely intense electromagnetic wave emitted from a plasma display.

With respect to Claim 30, Tone teaches that the metallic layer is formed between the filter support and the support member (see at least Figure 7).

With respect to Claim 31, Tone teaches that the metallic layer is electrically connected with the film type front surface filter and the filter support (see at least Figure 7).

With respect to Claim 33, Tone teaches that the metallic layer, the filter support and the support member respectively have at least one hole and a screw (metallic screw, Figure 7) disposed to pass through the hole such that the metallic layer, the filter support and the support member are fixed to one another (refer at least Figure 7).

With respect to Claim 38, Tone teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 34 above). Tone fails to teach that the prescribed area corresponds to an area not overlapping with the panel. In the same field of endeavor, Koike teaches that the prescribed area corresponds to an area not overlapping with the panel in order to ensure capability of shielding other electromagnetic waves than a visible light from among electromagnetic waves generated from display screen (Col. 1, lines 9-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the area of the film type front surface filter, as disclosed by Koike, in the PDP of Tone in order to ensure capability of shielding other electromagnetic waves than a visible light from among electromagnetic waves generated from display screen.

With respect to Claim 40, Tone teaches that the front surface filter is a film type front surface filter (“front plate,” 1 of Fig. 7).

With respect to Claim 41, the claim is rejected over the same reasons as stated in the rejection of Claim 38. Motivation to combine would be the same as stated above.

With respect to Claim 42, Tone teaches that the filter (8) contacts the panel such that the filter is provided on the panel (via back cover & filter support, Fig. 7).

With respect to Claim 43, Tone teaches that the filter (8) contacts the panel such that the filter is provided on the panel (via back cover & filter support, Fig. 7).

With respect to Claim 44, Tone teaches that the filter (8) contacts the panel such that the filter is provided on the panel (via back cover & filter support, Fig. 7).

With respect to Claim 45, Tone-Koike teaches that the extending portion does not overlap with the panel (see at least Fig. 6, 7 of '191).

With respect to Claim 46, Tone teaches that the film type front surface filter does not include a glass layer (color-correcting function, Col. 7, lines 55-67 – Col. 8, lines 1-2).

With respect to Claim 47, Tone teaches that the film type front surface filter does not include a glass layer (color-correcting function, Col. 7, lines 55-67 – Col. 8, lines 1-2).

With respect to Claim 48, Tone teaches that the film type front surface filter does not include a glass layer (color-correcting function, Col. 7, lines 55-67 – Col. 8, lines 1-2).

4. Claims 8, 17, 19, 20-21, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tone et al (US 6686536 B2) in view of Koike et al (US 6965191 B2) in further view of Yoshikawa et al (US 6255778 B1).

With respect to Claim 8, Tone-Koike teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 5 above). Tone-Koike is silent regarding a plurality of protrusions on the filter support. In the same field of endeavor, Yoshikawa teaches a plurality of protrusions on the filter support (adhesive tape 7, particles may have granular or pellet-like configuration; see at least Figure 1; Col.6, lines 21-45) in order to ensure high bond strength of the adhesive tape material (Col. 5, lines 20-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the filter support, as disclosed by Yoshikawa, in the PDP of Tone-Koike ensure high bond strength of the adhesive tape material.

With respect to Claim 17, the claim is rejected over the same reasons stated in the rejection of Claims 13 & 14.

With respect to Claim 19, the claim is rejected over the same reasons stated in the rejection of Claims 8 & 14.

With respect to Claim 20-21, Tone-Koike teaches at least one fastener means comprising at lease one screw and hole through which the screw is inserted (refer to '536; metallic screw, Figure 8) for physically connecting the front cover and the filter support with the film type front surface filter.

With respect to Claim 32, Tone-Koike teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 5 above). Tone-Koike is silent regarding a plurality of protrusions on

the filter support. In the same field of endeavor, Yoshikawa teaches a plurality of protrusions on the filter support (adhesive tape 7, particles may have granular or pellet-like configuration; see at least Figure 1; Col.6, lines 21-45) in order to ensure high bond strength of the adhesive tape material (Col. 5, lines 20-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the filter support, as disclosed by Yoshikawa, in the PDP of Tone-Koike ensure high bond strength of the adhesive tape material.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 3/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. In response to Applicant's arguments that Tone fails to disclose a film type front surface filter formed on a surface of the panel, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

That the claims read "a film type front surface filter formed on a surface of the panel" does not necessitate the physical limitation of there being a *direct contact*. Hence, that the front surface filter is formed above and connected via a filter support and front cover, the limitation of being "formed on" is met. Examiner suggests applicant modify the claim language to include a film type front surface filter -- formed *directly* on a surface of the panel --. Accordingly, the limitation of a film type front surface filter formed on a surface of the panel is disclosed by Tone's teaching, which falls within applicant's claimed invention.

B. In response to Applicant's arguments that none of Tone, Koike or their combination disclose or suggest a film type front surface filter disposed at a front

surface of a panel to have a wider area than the panel, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner does not refer to Fig. 3, in the previous action provided, but rather refers to the applicable Fig. 6, where, clearly, the filter 60 extends beyond the length of the display device 00, hence having an area that is wider than the panel. The remarks made to the width of the various layers in Koike is irrelevant, as the claim is related to a function of area and not a function of overall volume, hence the thickness or width of the layers is not applicable. Accordingly, the limitation a film type front surface filter disposed at a front surface of a panel to have a wider area than the panel is disclosed by Koike's teaching of, which falls within applicant's claimed invention.

For the reasons stated above, the rejection of the claims is deemed proper.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hana A. Sanei whose telephone number is (571) 272-8654. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Hana A. Sanei
Examiner


Joseph Williams
Primary Examiner